

If I may, sir, let me now introduce Robert Doubeck, who is the Project Director, as you know, of the Memorial activity.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you.

MR. DOUBECK: Good morning, Mr. Chairman.

We appear today to present for your selection of approval three alternate proposals for the location of the sculpture, flag, and directory holders at the Memorial site.

As you recall, this Commission approved the addition of these elements in October, but returned their locations for further study.

We are also presenting today a revised design for the directory holders.

Following your action in October, VVMF brought together Kent Cooper, our architect; Frederick Hart, the sculptor and Joe Brown, the landscape architect, who has been retained to consult and look into an integration of design, and consult on location problems.

Proposal "A", to my right, is the result of cooperative effort. At the request of Senators Mathias and Warner, and to accommodate the interest of Secretary of Interior Watt in having this Commission and the National Capital Planning Commission consider several options for locating the sculpture and flag staff, the VVMF, in January, developed and submitted

proposals "B" and "C".

Proposal "B" is that preferred by former Congressman Don Bailey and his associates, which closely approximates the proposal which we submitted to you in October.

Proposal "C" was suggested as a means to provide strong visual presence for both the flag staff and sculpture from major adjoining streets, while preserving the entry concept.

While VVMF strongly prefers proposal "A", it shall honor its commitment to carry out whichever of these plans this Commission and the National Capital Planning Commission approves and selects. We believe that proposal "A" maximizes the strength and impact on the Memorial of our national flag and the sculpture of fighting men by Mr. Hart, and at the same time it achieves an integrated, harmonious whole for all elements of the Memorial, without detracting from or interfering with or diminishing or overpowering the flag, the sculpture, or the walls. The overall plans of Constitution Gardens is respected and further refined. It is most advantageous for handicapped access.

Mr. Cooper and Mr. Brown and Mr. Hart will present the details of this, our preferred proposal, but I would like to first outline our thinking on the name directory function.

Its purpose, as you know, is to allow visitors to quickly locate a particular name on the chronological listing on the walls. No matter what medium would be developed to provide this, a permanent directory function at the site, we planned to and did produce a bound volume which you see here, which consists of the names in alphatebical order and provides their exact location on the wall by panel and line number, as well as other identifying information about each individual. We are presently distributing about 2,000 copies of this to congressional offices, the Senate, VA hospitals, and other offices that families and veterans are likely to be contacting for information about the memorial.

We did detailed research into the questinn of a permanent on-site device to which visitors may refer when no Park Service guides are on duty. The alternatives we considered included a mechanical rolodex and weatherproof housing, a computerized system with names displayed on the TV screen. We found the best bystem was simplest, this printed directory in a weatherproof enclosure. It is best because it is dignified. It is not a gadget, it is not intrusive at the site. A visitor doesn't have to follow any special instruction to use it. The names can be found more quickly than with a computer.

We plan for four separate holdings, including one which is specially designed for the handicapped. Additional

ones, of course, can be added as the needs dictate. Above all, we feel this proposed system is the best one because of its ease of maintenance, which consists simply of replacing the volumes as they become worn or damaged. Consequently, it will never be out of order.

No device, of course, could exclusively accommodate the visitor or the locator function at extremely high periods of visitation. This need will be met, especially during the first two years of the memorial operation, by the National Park Service volunteer guide program. A dedicated group of local citizens has already donated uncounted hours in assisting visitors at the site.

During the National Salute to Vietnam Veterans and the dedication of the memorial in November, the tremendous positive emotional effect of the memorial on veterans and non-veterans alike was evident. We urge this Commission to select one of the three proposals before you so that the VVMF can continue its work and complete the memorial by the end of this year.

I would now like to introduce Mr. Kent Cooper, our architect.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you.

MR. NETSCH: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman. I did not recall his saying how many of those units would be required at the

site.

MR. DOUBECK: Presently we plan for four. But it is almost infinitely expandable. It can be added to relatively easily, and at low cost, if there is a need dictated. More can be added as needed.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Are there locations indicated on the proposals?

MR. COOPER: No. I am planning to speak to that, if I may.

Mr. Atherton, here is some formal testimony, if you would like to have it for the Commission.

MR. ATHERTON: Thank you very much.

PROPOSAL "A"

MR. COOPER: I would like to tell you a little bit about what we have done since the meeting last fall in which you asked that we consider the formation of an entrance plaza and an integrated design which would be both a fitting location for the sculpture, a prominent location for the flag, as well as reflect the basic design.

We started our work looking at the urban design aspects of Constitution Gardens, because we thought that is where the real problem was. The plan that you see here of the overall garden indicates the present path structure. As we go to the site, those of us that know the site well, and